REMARKS

Applicant has carefully reviewed the office action mailed April 24, 2007. Applicant further thanks the Examiner for the telephone interview held on May 3, 2007, and the present amended is intended to implement the conclusions of our meeting. The present amendment is intended to be fully responsive to all points of objection raised by the Examiner, and is believed to place the application in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance is hereby solicited.

Applicant herein amends claims 1, 10, 13 – 18, 20 – 21, 30, and 33 - 38. Support for the amendments is found in the originally filed specification and claims. No new matter is added by these amendments. Claims 1 - 44 remain in the case.

The presently presented amendments clarify the independent claims to specifically recite that the powering is for a limited predetermined time period, i.e. temporary. It is to be noted that originally filed claims 14, 15, 17 and 18 as well as claims 34, 25, 37 and 38 are addressed to specifying the particular predetermined time period, and thus the amendment presented herein represents a clarification of the originally filed claims and is believed to place the application in condition for allowance.

SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW

A telephonic interview was held May 3, 2007. The differences between LeCreff, Katzenberg and the subject invention were discussed, particularly in relation to claims 1 and 21. It was clarified that the subject invention supplies operating power to the powered device for a limited predetermined time period, unlike LeCreff, which merely transmits a signal indicative of the lack of power and Katzenberg which shuts down power in response to an overload from the powered device. Neither LeCreff nor Katzenberg suggest powering an identified device for a predetermined time period, thereby notifying the end user of the excess demand condition. Advantageously, notifying the end user by fully powering the device for a predetermined time period further identifies that the device is fully operational, and is not at fault.

It was further pointed out that the amendment herein presented is a clarification of the originally presented claim. In particular originally filed claims 14, 15, 17 and 18 as well as claims 34, 25, 37 and 38 are addressed to specifying the particular predetermined time period.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 103

A. Claims 1 – 7, 14 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Katzenberg U.S. 6,218,930 in view of LeCreff (U.S. Patent Application Publication S/N 2003/0072438). Independent claim 1 has been amended, as described above, to positively recite that power, sufficient to fully power the attached powered device, is temporarily supplied temporarily for a predetermined interval responsive to the identified excess demand condition. Katzenberg supplies power to a detected device, and only removes power in the event of a detected overload condition (col. 3 line 55). Thus, power is not supplied temporarily for the predetermined time interval of the subject invention responsive to the identified excess demand condition.

LeCreff explicitly states that an alert signal must be low enough so as not to be mixed up by the detector as remote powering (paragraph 0026 – 0027). Thus, LeCreff is addressed away from the subject invention which fully powers a detected device for a predetermined time interval.

The combination of Katzenberg and LeCreff can not teach what neither of them teaches.

Claim 1 as amended is thus deemed patentable over the combination of Katzenberg and LeCreff. Claims 2 -7, 14 and 15 are patentable at least for depending on patentable claim 1.

Additionally, claims 14 and 15 are addressed to particular ranges of predetermined time intervals for powering, which are preferably sufficient to allow for full powering and initialization of identified powered devices. Allowing the powered device to complete initialization is advantageous in that it enables the end user to identify that the powered device is functioning properly and that the lack or normal operation is due to an excess demand condition at the power sourcing equipment. Neither Katzenberg nor LeCreff

envision powering an identified powered device for a predetermined time period of between 10 seconds and 2 minutes.

B. Claims 8 – 13 and 16 – 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Katzenberg in view of LeCreff in further view of Lehr (U.S. Patent 6,473,608).

Claims 8 - 13, and 16 -18 are deemed patentable at least for depending on patentable amended claim 1 as described above.

Claim 10 is further deemed patentable in reciting that each of the powered device in the queue are alternatingly temporarily powered for a predetermined time interval, the temporary powering being sufficient to fully power the attached powered device. None of the prior art cited suggests alternatingly temporarily powering devices in a queue for a predetermined time interval. Katzenberg powers devices which are detected and Lehr powers devices on a queue controlled basis, however the powering of neither Lehr nor Katzenberg is alternatingly temporarily for a predetermined time interval. Additionally, claims 13 and 16 are addressed to particular ranges of predetermined time intervals for powering, which are preferably sufficient to allow for full powering and initialization of identified powered devices. Allowing the powered device to complete initialization is advantageous in that it enables the end user to identify that the powered device is functioning properly and that the lack or normal operation is due to an excess demand condition at the power sourcing equipment. None of Katzenberg, LeCreff or Lehr, or any combination thereof, envision powering an identified powered device for a predetermined time period of between 10 seconds and 2 minutes.

Claim 17 and 18 are further patentable in reciting the first time interval as a function of the number of identifiers in the queue or sum of the power requirements, respectively. The examiner suggests that this is taught by Lehr; however applicant respectfully disagrees. Lehr teaches a queue of unpowered nodes. Nodes are not supplied power for a predetermined limited time period, whose time period is a function of the number of identifiers in the queue or the sum of the power requirements. Only the power required for the operation of a particular node is examined, and power is supplied, if available, on a queue-controlled prioritized basis. Power is thus not supplied for a predetermined time interval which is a

function of the number of identifiers in the queue, as in claim 18, or a function of the sum of the power requirements, as in claim 19.

C. Claims 21 – 27, 34 and 35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Katzenberg in view of LeCreff and Watamoto (U.S. Patent 6,392,695).

Independent claim 21 has been amended, as described above, to positively recite that power, sufficient to fully power the attached powered device, is temporarily supplied for a predetermined time interval, responsive to the identified excess demand condition. Katzenberg supplies power to a detected device, and only removes power in the event of a detected overload condition (col. 3 line 55). Thus, power is not supplied temporarily for the predetermined time interval of the subject invention responsive to the identified excess demand condition.

LeCreff explicitly states that an alert signal must be low enough so as not to be mixed up by the detector as remote powering (paragraph 0026 – 0027). Thus, LeCreff is addressed away from the subject invention which fully powers a detected device for a predetermined time interval.

Watamoto teaches a timing interval for giving a warning to a user on as screen for a predetermined time before the power supply to the deck is turned off, the power being turned off due to the deck being in a halt condition. Thus, power in Watamoto is not temporarily supplied for a predetermined time period responsive to an excess demand condtion, in fact power may have been supplied for an indeterminate time period, only a predetermined delay prior to shut down is taught.

. None of Katzenberg, LeCreff and Watamoto teach temporarily supplying operating power for a predetermined interval responsive to an identified excess demand condition. The combination can not teach what none of them teaches.

Claims 22 – 27, 34 and 35 are deemed patentable at least for depending on patentable claim 21.

Additionally, claims 34 and 35 are addressed to particular ranges of predetermined time intervals for powering, which are preferably sufficient to allow for full powering and initialization of identified powered devices. Allowing the powered device to complete

initialization is advantageous in that it enables the end user to identify that the powered device is functioning properly and that the lack or normal operation is due to an excess demand condition at the power sourcing equipment. Neither Katzenberg nor LeCreff envision powering an identified powered device for a predetermined time period of between 10 seconds and 2 minutes.

D. Claims 28 – 33, 36 and 38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Katzenberg, LeCreff and Watamoto in view of Lehr.

Claims 28 - 33, 36 and 38 are deemed patentable at least for depending on patentable amended claim 21 as described above.

Claim 30 is further deemed patentable in reciting that each of the powered devices in the queue is alternatingly temporarily powered for a predetermined time interval by the alternator, the temporary power being sufficient to fully power the attached powered device. None of the prior art cited suggests alternatingly temporarily powering devices in a queue for a predetermined time interval. Katzenberg powers devices which are detected and Lehr powers devices on a queue controlled basis, however the powering is not alternatingly temporarily for a predetermined time interval.

Additionally, claims 33 and 36 are addressed to particular ranges of predetermined time intervals for the temporary powering, which are preferably sufficient to allow for full powering and initialization of identified powered devices. Allowing the powered device to complete initialization is advantageous in that it enables the end user to identify that the powered device is functioning properly and that the lack or normal operation is due to an excess demand condition at the power sourcing equipment. None of Katzenberg, LeCreff, Watamoto or Lehr, or any combination thereof, envision powering an identified powered device for a predetermined time period of between 10 seconds and 2 minutes.

Claim 37 and 38 are further patentable in reciting the first time interval as a function of the number of identifiers in the queue or sum of the power requirements, respectively. The examiner advises that this is taught by Lehr, and applicant respectfully disagrees. Lehr teaches a queue of unpowered nodes. Nodes are not supplied power for a limited time

period, whose time period is a function of the number of identifiers in the queue or the sum of the power requirements. Only the power required for the operation of a particular node is examined, and power is supplied, if available, on a queue-controlled prioritized basis. Power is thus not supplied for a predetermined time interval which is a function of the number of identifiers in the queue, as in claim 18, or a function of the sum of the power requirements, as in claim 19.Watamoto simply displays a message prior to shut down. The combination of LeCreff, Lehr and Watamoto can not teach what none of them teaches.

Additionally, claim 37 recites a time interval of powering which is a function of the number of identifiers in the queue and claim 38 recites a time interval which is a function of the sum of the of power requirements of the powered devices in the queue. Adjusting the amount of time to be powered is neither taught nor suggested by Lehr, LeCreff or Watamoto. Lehr places upowered nodes in a queue, however Lehr does not power nodes for a time interval which is a function of the number of nodes in the queue. Lehr simply places them in a queue awaiting additional power, and thus the time interval of powering is not a function of the identifiers of the queue. LeCreff does not teach a queue and does not power for a limited time interval. Watamoto neither supplies a queue, nor a sets a time interval dependent on identifiers or classes of the queue. The combination of LeCreff, Lehr and Watamoto can not teach what none of them teaches.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, allowance of all pending claims (i.e., Claims 1 - 44) is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicant's undersigned agent by telephone if it would in any way aid in the advancement of this application to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 7, 2007

/Simon Kahn/
Simon Mark Kahn
Reg. No. 48,249
Director of Intellectual Property
PowerDsine, Ltd.

Tel: 1-703-486-1150
Fax: 1-703-892-4510